



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Patent application of:
Stephen Mulcahy, et al.

Group Art Unit: 3782

Serial No.: 10/509,301

Examiner:
Gary E. Elkins

Filed: August 16, 2005

For: IMPROVEMENTS IN AND RELATING TO
CORRUGATED CARDBOARD SUPPORTS

Charles N. Quinn
Reg. No. 27,223
Fox Rothschild LLP
2000 Market Street, 10th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Tel: 215-299-2135
Fax: 215-299-2150
Email: cquinn@foxrothschild.com
Deposit Account: 50-1943
Customer No. 34,661

RESPONSE

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Introductory Remarks

This is submitted in reply to the final official action dated January 30, 2007.

Applicant traverses the rejections of claims 1, 2 and 4-15 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for purportedly failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant further traverses the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 11 made under 35 USC 103 as allegedly being unpatentably obvious in view of Ringer in view of either Weaver or Forbes, Jr.

Attorney Docket No. 78803.03501
S/N 10/509,301

Applicant additionally traverses the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 11 made under 35 USC 103 as allegedly being unpatentably obvious in view of Henry or Ward each taken in view of Single and either Weaver or Forbes, Jr.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 10, 12, 14 and 15 made under 35 USC 103 as allegedly being unpatentably obvious in view of over Ward in view of Single and either Weaver or Forbes, Jr. and further in view of Rexford or Zimmerman.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 10 and 12-15 as allegedly being unpatentably obvious when considered in light of Henry in view of Single and either Weaver or Forbes and further in view of Rexford or Zimmerman.

Applicant still further traverses the rejection of claims 10 and 12-15 as allegedly being unpatentably obvious under 35 USC 103 based on Ringer when considered in view of either Weaver or Forbes, Jr. and further in view of Rexford or Zimmerman.

Reconsideration of the application as filed and as amended herein below is respectfully requested.

This response should be entered since with the amendments to the claims, the claims are, in Applicant's view, *prima facie* in form for allowance, and no further search or detailed consideration of the claims by the examiner should be necessary to allow this application.